UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/588,947	08/10/2006	Philip Peter Battle	20272-00738-US1	2466
	10/588,947 08/10/2006 Philip Peter Battle	EXAMINER		
1875 EYE STREET, N.W.		REDDING, DAVID A		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3723	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/22/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Comments	10/588,947	BATTLE ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	/David A. Redding/	3723			
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 A	Jugust 2006				
· <u> </u>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
					
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
 4) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 					
Application Papers					
 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 August 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. 					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/10/06.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate			

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-7,9, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 2004/0231096 (Battle et al.) in view of USP 4,376,322 (Lockhart et al.).

Battle et al. disclose a hose assembly having a first end 13 attached with the cleaner 1 and a second free end 14, a hose having a natural extended length [0007] and being retracted to a shorter length by occluding passage of air through the hose assembly toward the free end 14 and wherein the assembly includes a tubular wand slidable coaxially relative to the hose [0039]. To occlude the passage of air the assembly includes a valve 16. The hose assembly is not confined to canister cleaners but can be applied to upright cleaners [0028].

Lockhart et al. disclose an upright vacuum cleaner in which the wand 190 of the hose 173 is retained in a generally vertical orientation in the stowed position.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art that when the hose assembly in Battle et al. is used in an upright cleaner that the hose could be retained within the handle of the cleaner in a generally vertical orientation, as taught in Lockhart et al.

Regarding claim 3, switching the relative position of the wand to the hose is considered to be within the skill in the art since the function of the hose assembly is not changed with the change in position.

In the absence of unexpected result, the relative lengths of the wand and hose in Battle et al. are considered to be obvious.

Claims 1,2,4,6,9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by USP 4,376,322 (Lockhart et al.).

Lockhart et al. disclose an upright vacuum cleaner comprising a hose assembly having a first end 173, a second free end (opposite end), a hose connecting the ends which has a natural length and being retractable to a shorter length by occluding passage of air through the hose assembly toward the free end (col. 9, lines 15 thru 27), a tubular wand 190 slidable coaxially relative to the hose (figure 20).

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Battle et al. as applied to claim1 above, and further in view of USP 5,358,290 (Fleet et al.).

Fleet et al. disclose a a vacuum wand 10 which is slidable inside of hose 12 such that in an extended position the wand 10 is sealed with the hose flange 20. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to provide the coupling arrangement in Fleet et al. into the wand hose assembly of Battle et al. in order to prevent reduced suction when the hose wand assembly is in use.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to /David A. Redding/ whose telephone number is 571-272-1276. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 6:00 - 3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Hail can be reached on 571-272-4485. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3723

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/David A Redding/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 3723

DAR